

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 11, 12, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1, 11, 12, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite.

Claims 1, 11, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanazawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,559,814) (hereinafter “Kanazawa ‘814”) in view of Kanazawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,072) (hereinafter “Kanazawa ‘072”).

Claims 2-9 and 13-18 are allowed.

Claim 12 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 12, 19 and 20 to improve the form of the claims and/or to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application.

Accordingly, claims 1-9 and 11-20 currently remain pending for consideration.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1, 11, 12, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 11, 12, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants

have amended claims 1, 11, 12, 19 and 20 along the lines of the Examiner's helpful suggestion provided at page 3 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as newly-amended, fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs is respectfully requested.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 11, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanazawa '814 in view of Kanazawa '072. Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 19 and 20 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application's specification.

Newly-amended independent claim 1 of the instant application describes a combination of features with regard to a method for driving a plasma display panel having a plurality of row electrode sets, each including two first electrodes and one second electrode interposed between said first electrodes, the first electrodes and the second electrode respectively acting as scanning electrodes and a sustain electrode, or vice versa, and said second electrode interposed between neighboring display cells such that said second electrode is shared by said neighboring display cells, wherein said neighboring display cells are adjacent in a direction intersecting with a direction where said scanning electrodes and sustaining electrode extend. The method described in newly-amended independent claim 1 includes applying sustaining pulses alternately to the neighboring ones of said first and second electrodes. The method described in newly-amended independent claim 1 also includes changing at least one condition selected from the group

consisting of pulse width and interval of said sustaining pulses in response to changes in polarity of said sustaining pulses.

Accordingly, embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application, as described in newly-amended independent claim 1, include a feature in that at least one condition selected from the group consisting of pulse width and interval of the sustaining pulses is changed in response to a change in polarity of such sustaining pulses. Applicant notes further that the methodology described in newly-amended independent claim 11 includes a similar feature as independent claim 1, but it differs in that a voltage is changed in response to every change in polarity of said sustaining pulses. Applicant respectfully submits that with these arrangements, an emission area on the sustain electrode can be controlled as shown in Figs. 10A, 10B, 12A and 12B, thereby improving the brightness or improving the vertical resolution.

On the other hand, Applicant respectfully submits that Kanazawa '072 discloses a method to change a voltage of sustaining pulses in response to every fifth change of polarity of the sustaining pulses, as shown in Fig. 12. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Kanazawa '072 does not disclose, or even suggest, for example, the advantageous feature of embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application, as described in the claims, of a methodology to change voltage in response to every change in polarity of the sustaining pulses.

Even further, Applicant respectfully submits that Kanazawa '072 has an objective to provide a multi-step luminance within one subfield, which is quite different from the disclosed embodiments of the instant application and the inventions described in the claims. Kanazawa '814 does not cure the deficiencies of Kanazawa '072 in this regard. Independent claims 19 and 20 have also been amended to include similar features as the remaining newly-amended

independent claims. Accordingly, similar arguments as stated above also apply to newly-amended independent claims 19 and 20.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application described in newly-amended independent claims 1, 11, 19 and 20 are particularly different from the disclosures of the applied Kanazawa ‘072 and Kanazawa ‘814 references.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Kanazawa ‘072 nor Kanazawa ‘814, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 11, 19 and 20, as amended. MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” Furthermore, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that dependent claim 12 includes allowable subject matter. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent claim 12 is also allowable at least because of its dependence from claim 11, and the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claim 12 is respectfully requested. The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 2-9 and 13-18 are allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**



Paul A. Fournier  
Reg. No. 41,023

Dated: August 21, 2006

By:

**Customer No. 055694**  
**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**  
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005-1209  
Tel.: (202) 842-8800  
Fax: (202) 842-8465